

HERRERA: QUESTIONS AND CONTRADICTIONS IN THE CRITICAL TRADITION

Andreina Bianchini
Trinity College

*... il sentimento senza l'immagine è cieco, e
l'immagine senza il sentimento è vuota.*

Benedetto Croce

No one would question that Fernando de Herrera has achieved the renown that was his deepest aspiration. His work is increasingly present in the world of Siglo de Oro scholarship, as shown by the intensification, in the last twenty years, of research centered on the reclusive Sevillian. Nevertheless, there is something vaguely unsettling about the scholarly discussion centering on this author. It may derive in part from the general reluctance to concede unconditionally that Herrera is a great poet who holds his own in the illustrious triad Garcilaso-Herrera-Góngora. Yet this reluctance coexists with another: to simply classify him, once and for all, as a minor poet. We are periodically reminded that Herrera was not a genuinely inspired bard (Celaya, López Bueno),¹ or that his verses consist largely of "retórica y grandilocuencia" (Armiño 35). And yet the interest he arouses persists, while questions, contradictions and ambiguities remain. This essay will focus on a few of those unresolved issues which, even setting aside the vexed question of the textual tradition, seem to cling to the life and work of this withdrawn and ultimately solitary man who, as one of the ironies of history, was known in his time as "el Divino."

Herrera's reputation as a poet first rested on his heroic verses (Coster, Blasi). As the author of grandiloquent odes of Pindaric and Biblical resonances, he seemed to give an exquisitely-crafted expression of the imperial spirit of the reign of Philip II. These swollen heroic odes speak far less to our own time. The contemporary view holds that the greater achievement lies in the amorous collection, which also represents the lion's share of his production. R. O. Jones

already viewed the question as settled, and clearly affirmed that "la mejor poesía de Herrera es la amorosa" (151). Thus, while contemporary criticism finds much more merit in his poetry than was previously the case, his work still remains the object of ambivalent critical evaluation.

It was clear since his own lifetime that Herrera was determined to be the greatest Spanish epigon of Petrarch.² His work constitutes the only example, in Spain, of what we might call the *canzoniere* genre; i.e., the idealized, temporally extensive account of an amorous passion, presented in a corpus of poems intended to appear as narrative fragments. The narrative revolves largely on a dozen or so recurrent motifs (overpowering ardor/celebration of beauty / hope / despair / solitude / memory / absence / fidelity / suffering / resignation) supported by a conventional set of natural environments. The *canzoniere* corpus itself was a kind of *exemplum vitae*, exhibiting, theoretically, a Neoplatonic transcendence of earthly human passion. While Petrarch was the greatest model and influence for our Sevillian, the authenticity and intensity of sentiment which assumes poetic form in the elegiac tones of the Italian's *canzoniere* seem attenuated or diverted in Herrera. This was obliquely acknowledged even in the posthumous 1619 edition of his work, in which the eminent prologuist, the humanist, poet and statesman Francisco de Rioja damned the great Sevillian even as he defended him: "los versos...ni carecen de afectos, como dicen algunos, antes tienen muchos i generosos, sino que se ascoñden i pierden a la vista entre los ornatos poeticos" (Rioja 45-46).

In sum, Herrera devoted the vast majority of his creative work to the composition and polishing of his love poems. Yet, while his technical proficiency finds universal recognition, his amorous verses frequently fail to captivate the reader/listener. This fact further fuels the debate in critical circles as to the biographical authenticity of his feelings for Doña Leonor de Milán, Condesa de Gelves.³ While earlier critics naturally presumed an autobiographical foundation for the poetry (Rodríguez Marín, Coster, Vilanova), more recent scholars have been divided on conceding any biographical validity to an idealized and symbolic poetic content. While some feel that there was no doubt a real passion behind the impulse to compose the poetry (Gallego Morell, Macrí, López Bueno), others (Celaya, Cuevas, Prieto) reject that hypothesis. These latter hold

that, in any event, a poet certainly need not actually *feel* a particular sentiment in order to produce a perfectly valid poetic projection of it. Furthermore, all assumptions of biographical authenticity in Neoplatonic love poetry are fallacious and irrelevant, even in the case of Petrarch. Indeed, in the opinion of some critics, such as Cuevas, the case of Petrarch and the misrepresentation of his poetry in the Cinquecento as inspired in a real and human love for Laura is at the origin of the enduring prevarication.⁴

Neoplatonic love poetry, which, it is widely held, includes Herrera's, is an intellectual experience, an itinerary of the soul in its quest for the vision of the divine source of beauty, attainable only through all-consuming love, which in turn is the essence of the spirit that governs the universe. As such, as an *itinerarium mentis in Deum*, it not only does not need, but could not have, a human being as its ultimate object.

However, in support of a definition of Herrera's love poetry as Neoplatonic in character there are only seven sonnets and one *canción* in which there occur a kind of metahuman transfiguration of the beloved. It is certainly true that the poetic names for Doña Leonor—Luz, and its variants (Lumbre, Estrella, Aglaya, Eliodora, Leucotea)—hold special significance in the Neoplatonic universe of discourse. Nevertheless, the predominant mood of Herrera's verse is one of anguish, indeed, torment. If he was pursuing a Neoplatonic ideal, the result appears to be a failure. At least eleven sonnets show him persevering in a "vano desseo peligroso."⁵ Such a disconsolate and unrepentent affliction born of implacable desire is hardly consonant with the lofty philosophical purposes of the Neoplatonic school of thought.⁶ Furthermore, notoriously absent from Herrera's verses is the standard palinode, the renunciation on the part of a wiser and older poet of the frivolous passions of his youth.⁷ While no scholar today would hold Herrera's love poetry—or that of any other poet—to be an unmediated autobiographical document, I do suspect that we must take the obsessive poetic expression of torment and frustration as having its origin in sentiments that were integral to the existential substance of the poet. The suffering and frustration may derive from the general circumstances of his life, which remain in mystery, or from a perfectly plausible frustrated or unrequited love. But they must be authentic, or the poetry is a simulation, a formal exercise, an elaborate but empty vessel.

One might rightly wonder *not* whether it was plausible for Herrera to have loved the Condesa, and for her to have flirted with the idea of corresponding, but *whether it is conceivable* for this powerful and passionate intellect to have lived almost without a biography. Mauro Armiño said it with laconic matter-of-factness: "Su vida, en el aspecto anecdótico, sería totalmente gris si no fuera por el episodio amoroso que constituye el núcleo matriz de su poesía, y que ha quedado envuelto en brumas, pese a las constantes búsquedas eruditas" (32).

The extraordinary notion of a poetry completely divorced from its content is surely an overcompensation for the many centuries when poetry was conceived as a branch of moral philosophy or stylized autobiography. And yet, in reference to the thematic content of the poetry of another Sevillian *litteratus* whose biography remains more hidden than revealed—Herrera's prologuist Francisco de Rioja—López Bueno makes a point that students of Herrera would do well to apply to his case that "el texto poético sería la expresión de un desideratum, un anhelo hacia algo que, en definitiva, sería el reflejo más sincero del espíritu que lo hizo posible, más acorde, a la postre, con el hombre interior que con el hombre histórico de biografía concreta" (López Bueno 1987, 11). Surely the Neoplatonic and conventional substance of Herrera's verses has been exaggerated. Indeed, I suspect, with Celaya, that Herrera may have traveled the Platonic stairway in reverse, that "ha buscado la contemplación pura pero lo que encuentra es la pasión turbia" (Celaya 33). If he fails to captivate the reader with his verses, there must be another explanation.

The controversy over the veracity of his sentiments for Doña Leonor leads us to another uncertainty in Herrera criticism, which is the role of pure form in his work. The question is linked to the *res/verba* contention in sixteenth-century poetic theory, in which the Neo-Aristotelians held to the primacy of *res* while the Neoplatonists championed *verba*, or eloquence, as the essence of poetry. We see Herrera's alignment with this latter view in the *Anotaciones*, where, amidst the sketching out of a poetics of *verba*, we can read his definition of the poet's purpose: "Mas el poeta tiene por fin dezir compuestamente para admirar," and his conviction that "toda la excelencia de la poesía consista en el ornato de la elocución" (Gallego Morell 420, 418). In that famous commentary he also gives a

poignant description of the almost trance-like moments of pure inspiration experienced by poets, i.e. poetic furor⁸—although he both promoted and practiced an indefatigable *labor limae*. In the historical progression of Spanish poetry in the Siglo de Oro which is expressed in the above-mentioned triad, Garcilaso-Herrera-Góngora, Herrera is seen as occupying the middle position with regard to rhetorical intensification and formal complexity. As such, he points the way to Góngora, who in turn represents the culmination of the Baroque aesthetic and its corresponding “apoteosis del universo formal.”⁹ However, like the old *conceptista/culterano* division of Baroque poetry, which recent criticism has finally dismantled, we will probably find upon closer analysis that Garcilaso, Herrera and Góngora represent not so much a line of development as three different conceptions of poetry, and that they should be grouped together only as Spaniards sharing a common Classical background culture—“el código culturalista que sustenta el edificio de referencias eruditas” (López Bueno 1987, 22)—which emerges in their work in distinct ways, according to their distinct poetic personalities.

But let us return to the question of the primacy of form in Herrera. Critics who assert there is no autobiographical basis to Herrera’s love poetry—a product, in their view, of an eclectic imitation of models in a context of a purely intellectual Neoplatonism—also hold that the center of interest in Herrera’s poetry is the poetry itself, i.e. the form, the pure aesthetic experience which derives from the apprehension of a formal construct of great density, harmony and unity (Cuevas, Celaya, Prieto). But is this really possible? First, is it possible for an aesthetic experience that is alleged to derive from a purely formal experience to be great art? Could it be true poetry? Or only impressive craftsmanship? Second, is this in fact all that Herrera gives us? And third, was such a conception of poetry or art possible in sixteenth- or even seventeenth-century Spain? Was it conceivable, indeed, before the late nineteenth century? Is this the meaning of critics intend when they assert that “el principio del deleite, del hedonismo formal, había ya triunfado en la poesía española” (López Bueno 1987, 16)?

Even in the *caso-límite* which Góngora represents, it is no matter of simple fact that his object was exclusively to create formal beauty in an auto-referential mode, such as might conform to Jacob-

son's definition of the aesthetic function of language.¹⁰ Góngora's unique art consistently defied imitation: the army of would-be imitators could only reproduce the external mechanisms, but not that *other something*. The Cordobés most certainly posits a new vision of reality, in which unsuspected correspondences link together all the component elements in a new conception of nature.¹¹ That this New World is the object of the *peregrino* in the *Soledades*, and the beginning of modern poetry, was pointed out in Sinicropi's analysis of that poem. And surely this is what intimately persuades every reader of Góngora that they have entered the realm of great art, not merely a realm of pure form. The linguistic complexity is a conduit into a new reality. In the poetry of Garcilaso and of Góngora, as in that of Fray Luís, the form is always a bearer of meaning. It never takes the reader solely back to itself. Nor could such an idea have occurred to the austere, patriotic and neo-Stoic Herrera, poet in a Counter-Reformation Spain that still paid homage to "el contenidismo didáctico-moralista" (García Berrio 452). What the bold new authors of a poetics of form, beauty and inspiration (as opposed to *arte* or craftsmanship) intended—Herrera, and later, to an even greater degree, Carvallo—was, I posit, to counteract the oppressive tyranny of the Neo-Aristotelian preceptors, whose ideas were founded, as García Berrio reminds us, "en fórmulas técnicas demasiado estrechas e indiscutibles a las que se unía una imagen de absoluto poder del 'arte,' de didactismo-moralizador anti-hedonista y de la prioridad del contenido sobre la forma" (García Berrio 120). A restoration and positive re-evaluation of the aesthetic dimension as the essential and defining component of poetry was necessary in order to loosen constraints and open the way for the New Poetry of the seventeenth century.

Herrera's clear enunciation of a poetics of form does not, however, authorize us to assert that his aim was to achieve a formal perfection which then would constitute its own signified, the *significante* being the *significado*. Even when he writes that the aim of poetry is eloquence, what he surely means is that it must communicate its *meaning* with eloquence, an eloquence which for him implied a rhetorical and cultural density that, to be fully deciphered, requires a cultivated reader. Furthermore, the true aim of poetry is necessarily the achievement of such eloquence because it is only this that distinguishes it from non-poetry, that which distin-

guishes a thing being that which defines its essence. Perhaps the problem lies, not in Herrera's conceiving of a formal perfection whose sole purpose was to be itself, but rather in his pursuit of formal density as a display of high culture and *ingenium*. The purpose, then, of the complex eloquence would be the glorification of the poet's intellectual tour de force. Here we may recall Castelvetro's minimization of poetic furor. Prieto calls attention to Castelvetro's belief that the poet executes his work in order to demonstrate his *ingenium*, rather than availing himself of his *ingenium* in order to accomplish his work, contending that "la poetica è piú tosto da persona ingegnosa che da furiosa" (Prieto 415). Prieto contrasts this attitude, which he finds to be "camino a Herrera," with that of Garcilaso, for whom, borrowing verses from his Third Eclogue, the "puro ingenio y lengua casi muda" could be better heard than "la curiosidad del elocuente" (Prieto 415). If this is true, then an early Baroque display of *ingenium* becomes the "meaning" or content of Herrera's poetry.¹² A corollary to this view is that which finds in Herrera's exemplary mannerism the key to his poetry (Macrí). Emilio Orozco most closely touched the kernel of this elusive phase of late-Renaissance culture when he noted that, in mannerist poets and theorists, "hay una postura intelectual, estetista y técnica en su orientación que les hará buscar la consciente complicación, la dificultad por la dificultad, esto es, el acomodamiento de la expresión artística o poética a esquemas compositivos previos" (Orozco 31). We can then explain the "frialdad" of which Herrera was widely accused.

Herrera's mannerism must also be seen as a manifestation of his life-long goal to "illustrate" the Spanish literary tradition, and to raise it to the level of its military and political eminence. This objective would certainly explain the dogged pursuit of an illustrious rhetoric informed by real knowledge of the classical and Italian traditions, and a long experience with the secrets of poetic theory. The *Anotaciones* are an eloquent testimony to Herrera's convictions and commitment in this regard. His dedication to raising the level of Spanish literary discourse is indistinguishable from the same ardent patriotism that led him to write panegyric histories. Thus, while it is surely anti-historical to project a *self-reflective* formal universe into sixteenth-century Spain, even though the baroque frenzy of the seventeenth century is widely seen as a manifestation of the despair,

the *desengaño*, and the escapist impulses of that bleak time, we may perhaps render a more historically accurate description of Herrera's formal complexity by seeing it as an expression of his essentially areligious consciousness, coupled with his determination to bring high culture into the world of Spanish poetry, with the corresponding result of an art form offering an intellectual experience for the reader/listener. For the intellectuals who were indifferent to the religious ardor of the Counter Reformation, such as Herrera and, later, Góngora, the only road left open for the exercise of their *ingenium* was that offered by a poetics of form.

And yet, even granting the excessively cerebral character of Herrera's poetry and the consequent overworking of its formal tissue, and even granting that the rhetorical complexity was a statement about *ingenium* and cultural refinement, we are ultimately compelled to restore the signified to his significants, that is, to take Herrera at his word.¹³ The signified of most of Herrera's love poetry is a depiction of a grim and anguished world, of torment and frustration, which constitutes the substance of his inner universe, brightened only rarely by small joys artificially magnified in the otherwise unbroken desolation and solitude of the poet. The source of his poetry must be, ultimately, his sentiment, his vision and his existential experience, whether or not he loved the Condesa (which, I would argue, he most surely did). If, as Rioja tells us, the "afectos" are lost "entre los ornatos poéticos" it is not because Herrera did not feel deeply, but because he understood everything about poetry except how to do it. Herrera, writes Celaya, "nunca ha sido un poeta inspirado" (Celaya 39), a lack that he compensated for by a life of singular dedication to the *craft* of poetry, and which rewarded him with a great number of memorable verses, though few memorable poems. These memorable verses fall on both sides of the thematic, heroic and amorous. Lope's infallible instinct had already signalled the striking "Voz de dolor y canto de gemido" of the *canción* on the defeat of Rey don Sebastián at Alcázarquivir, and every student of Herrera has his/her favorite *loci*.

Having granted the cerebral nature of Herrera's vocation, a product more of the will than of the heart,¹⁴ we are faced with still another contradiction which envelops his work. No one would dispute that he was, before anything else, a man of erudition, a *docto*, to be numbered among *los que saben*. He left historical works, liter-

ary theory and criticism, a biography of Thomas More, and a corpus of poetry intended for a cultivated minority. And yet, we find no distinctive rendering of moral philosophy in Herrera. The philosophical content of his poetry can be summed up in the standard Neo-Stoic *topoi* of the Renaissance, which pondered the fugacity and destructive power of time and the vanity of human concerns. It usually occurred in association with the hopelessness of his love for Luz. As such, it has been recognized as a sub-category of his amorous verse and poetry of "desengaño" (Vilanova 738). Neither has Herrera given us commentary on his contemporary world that was anything but conformist, nor any historically valuable depiction of his times. Even tragedies such as the defeat of the Portuguese King Sebastian, which inspired four different poems, are seen as the result of divine punishment, a strictly moralist interpretation which ignores Renaissance advances in historiography. The fact is that our erudite Sevillian chose to devote most of his artistic life to the depiction of his internal universe, where we find not great intellectual or philosophical content, but an all-consuming passion. How different from another erudite poet, his contemporary Fray Lu s de Le n.

The poetry of Fray Lu s could only have come from the pen of an intellectual. The moral philosophy contained in those precious eight poems which constitute the basis of his reputation¹⁵—the desire to live apart from the bustle of the world, in the fertile solitude of study and thought, in contemplation of the wondrous order of the infinite universe, of time, of human destiny, of the divinity—is transformed into pure feeling rendered tremulously and movingly in the sobriety and delicacy of the *lira stanza*. In Fray Luis the intellectual character of his poetry is concentrated in its themes as well as its formal elaboration, and so thoroughly infused with feeling that it has never occurred to anyone that his verses "carecen de afectos." Thus, even in his chosen mode of intellectual and erudite poetry, Herrera must yield to the professor from Salamanca. In Herrera, erudition produces formal, rather than conceptual or passionate density. A poetry of moral philosophy could not emerge from the pen of Herrera. He was, as Socarras wrote, "un esp ritu que carece precisamente de esta cualidad esencial, de serenidad" (305).

Finally, another questionable truism in the critical tradition is that Herrera somehow occupies a leadership position in the famed

"escuela sevillana." This notion has been sorely tested by López Bueno. As she points out, there was no future or following of Herrera's thematic or manner, at least not in Seville. The Sevillian poets of the next generation—Arguijo, Medrano, Rioja, Andrada—moved toward a poetry of ethical content, of Horatian and Neo-Stoic inspiration. They leave behind Herrera's "soledades sonoras" for the "soledades morales" of a disenchanting era.¹⁶

Prieto, who traces the history of the notion of such a school back to an article by Arjona in 1806, finally concludes that, at best, one might concede the existence of a group of cultivated men united in their attempts to offset the vast number of "indoctos" who were writing poetry in Seville.¹⁷ Herrera thus may be considered, in the light of his poetic theory and practice, as the head of such a group (Prieto 601). Other critics have similarly contrasting views, and this question seems to have generated no more consensus than that of the belabored "drama textual."¹⁸

As a poet, Herrera's renown derives largely from the interest of other erudites like himself, scholars who feel an irresistible fascination for the mystery of his life and the air of quiet suffering that marked it.¹⁹ A poet without a biography. A case of a repressed but passionate nature, intent on transcending his pain in his work. Is this not what, like Vilanova, we see in Pacheco's famous portrait of him: "una faz impenetrable y casi ascética, reconcentrada en un gesto de orgullo y de tristeza que refleja con insólita agudeza el espíritu ensimismado, altanero y solitario del gran poeta sevillano" (Vilanova 697)?

One way to resolve the uneasiness about Herrera and the lack of synchronism between his considerable literary historical importance and his lesser significance as a poet is to focus more on his greatest achievements. Dispersed amidst an extended commentary on the poetry of Garcilaso, he quietly authored the first poetics of Neoplatonic inspiration in Spain, thereby providing the first theoretical support of the New Poetry of the seventeenth century. In addition, Herrera alone initiates the tradition of textual criticism in Spain. In the *Anotaciones*, Herrera boldly moves beyond both the uncritical accolade and the condemnation on moral grounds that fueled so much earlier writing on poets and poetry. He established criteria of literary criticism which are purely aesthetic. His praise or negative evaluations of Garcilaso's verses are always justified, that

is, explained, and explained by exclusively esthetic or poetic considerations.

The importance of the Herrera of the *Anotaciones a las obras de Garcilaso de la Vega* (1580) is neither controversial nor disputed. It is with this great commentary that the historical significance of Herrera must lie. Although a minor poet, his considerable accomplishments lie elsewhere. Herrera was Spain's first pure *litteratus*, first great textual critic, the first to formulate, albeit in a dispersive and fragmentary fashion, a poetics of profound significance. It was a poetics that would open the door to the great evasionist movement of *culturanismo* in an Empire which, as one of the seeds of its destruction, sought stability in the repression of the intellectual life.

Notes

¹See also Vilanova 714: "Pero desde el punto de vista del arte y de la originalidad creadora, este poeta dotado de una fecunda inspiración y de una virtuosa maestría, este innovador audaz que ha emulado los cantos pindáricos con el clamor resonante de sus odas heroicas y que ha buceado con una sensibilidad exquisita en los más recónditos paisajes de su alma dolorida, no ha logrado, pese a su inmenso talento de poeta, igualar el milagro lírico que encierra en eterna arquitectura de temblor, la voz doliente de Garcilaso."

²It is useful to bear in mind the importance of the assimilation of Petrarchan motifs for Spanish Renaissance poetry. As we read in R.O. Jones 144: "La historia de la poesía 'cortesá' española (distinguiéndola de la escrita en metros tradicionales) en el último período del XVI, es en gran parte la historia de la asimilación y adaptación de Petrarca."

³Bartolomé José Gallardo wrote: "siendo flojo galán, ¿Cómo podía ser fuerte poeta?" Qtd. in Prieto 605.

⁴See Cuevas: "toda la Europa renacentista recibía de Italia el ejemplo, lleno de sugerencias, de una poesía que, creada como ficción estético-sentimental, se convertía, por obra de sus exegetas, en documento de historia" (Herrera 23-24).

⁵McInnis (154) cites these as sonnets 1, 6, 7, 13, 15, 18, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31.

⁶According to McInnis 154: "the predominant emphasis in *Algunas Obras* is the poet's failure to transform his love for Leonor into spiritual contemplation of abstract beauty and virtue." See also Vilanova 716: "La idealización de su platonismo amoroso no alcanza nunca el desasimiento humano de la amada de Petrarca transfigurada en una criatura angélica y

celeste" and 728: "la pasión sensual y humana de Herrera trasciende en casi todas las composiciones embebidas del más puro platonismo amoroso."

⁷See López Bueno 1987, 50: "El problema se agrava desde el momento que el 'cancionero petrarquista' que es el texto de H no cumple con los estadios finales de sublimación trascendente del desengaño amoroso."

⁸In a note on Garcilaso's Eclogue II, Herrera writes of the *genio platónico*: "Es el que se ofrece a los ingenios divinos, y se mete dentro para que descubran con su luz las intelecciones de las cosas secretas que escriben. Y sucede muchas veces que resfriándose después aquel calor celeste en los escritores, ellos mismos o admiren, o no conozcan sus mismas cosas, y algunas veces no las entiendan en aquella razón a la cual fueron enderezadas y dictadas de él." Gallego Morell 531-32. Herrera also refers to "aquella suave hermosura que suspende y arrebatá nuestros ánimos con maravillosa violencia" (Gallego Morell 1972, 419).

⁹López Bueno (31) refers to "la apoteosis del universo formal barroco que se va fraguando en los antequerano-granadinos y culmina en Góngora."

¹⁰See Hawkes 86: "Verbal art, seen thus, is not referential in mode, and does not function as a transparent 'window' through which the reader encounters the poem's or the novel's 'subject.' Its mode is auto-referential; it is its own subject."

¹¹See also Mazzeo 54-55: "The universe is a vast net of correspondences which unites the whole multiplicity of being. The poet approaches and creates his reality by a series of more or less elaborate correspondences."

¹²Herrera himself understood this word differently. See *Anotaciones*, where he condemns those, so frequent in poetry-rich Seville, who "escriben sin algún cuidado y elección, llevados de sola fuerza de ingenio" (Gallego Morell 1972, 418).

¹³Interesting in this context is what Prieto (302) has to say about the nature of the poet when referring to Fray Luís: "La palabra poética nace de una experiencia que es evocada y luego transmitida, y es esa transmisión donde logra su eficacia comunicativa si el receptor siente (y conoce) por simpatía... aquella experiencia que el poeta evocó para nacer la palabra."

¹⁴Blasi (107) said it half a century ago: "Non è piú la poesia dettata dal cuore . . . Ma è poesia dettata dalla volontà."

¹⁵Rivers discusses the poetic production of Fray Luis in Chapter 6 of the *Storia della civiltà letteraria spagnola* (1990). After treating the occasional, religious and patriotic poems, he writes that "le otto poesie che rimangono, sono quelle su cui si basa la grande fama poetica di fray Luis: esprimono un

desiderio di pace pastorale e celestiale che è allo stesso tempo classico e cristiano" (388).

¹⁶See López Bueno 1987, 30: "La obra de todos ellos evidencia una ruptura respecto al modelo herreriano, al tiempo que se confirma continuadora de la tradición horaciana del siglo XVI. Con esta visión apuntamos la desautorización de un viejo patrón historiográfico de la 'escuela poética sevillana' como un bloque homogéneo a partir del magisterio de Herrera."

¹⁷A fundamental source which describes the literary environment of Herrera's Seville is Stanko Vranich's article, "Críticos, critiquillos y criticones (Herrera el sevillano frente a Sevilla)," now in his *Ensayos sevillanos del Siglo de Oro*, 13-27.

¹⁸The expression was coined by Macrí (143) who so denominates the chapter dealing with the textual problems of Herrera's verses.

¹⁹López Bueno 1987, 86: "La reivindicación de la figura de Herrera ha venido, en gran medida, de la mano de la erudición, cosa que, por lo demás, no estaría tan alejada de su propio concepto del arte poético."

Works Cited

- Armiño, Mauro. *Qué es verdaderamente EL SIGLO DE ORO*. Madrid: Doncel, 1973.
- Blasi, Ferruccio. *Dal Classicismo al Secentismo in Ispagna (Garcilaso—Herrera—Góngora)*. Aquila: Vecchioni, 1929.
- Celaya, Gabriel. *Exploración de la poesía*. 1963. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1971.
- Coster, Adolphe. *Fernando de Herrera (el Divino), 1534-1597*. Paris: xxx, 1908.
- Gallego Morell, Antonio. *Garcilaso de la Vega y sus comentaristas*. 2ª ed. rev. Madrid: Gredos, 1972.
- _____. *Estudios sobre poesía española del primer Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: Insula, 1970.
- García Berrio, Antonio. *Formación de la teoría literaria, II: Teoría poética del Siglo de Oro*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1980.
- Hawkes, Terence. *Structuralism and Semiotics*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1977.
- Herrera, Fernando de. *Poesía castellana original completa*. Ed. Cristóbal Cuevas. Madrid: Cátedra, 1985.
- Jones, R. O. *Historia de la literatura española, 2: Siglo de Oro, prosa y poesía*. Ed. rev. por Pedro M. Cátedra. Barcelona: Ariel, 1983.
- López Bueno, Begoña. *La poética cultista de Herrera a Góngora*. Sevilla: Alfar, 1987.
- Macrí, Oreste. *Fernando de Herrera*. 2nd. ed. Madrid: Gredos, 1972.

- Mazzeo, J. A. "Metaphysical Poetry and the Poetics of Correspondence." *Renaissance and Seventeenth Century Studies*. New York: Columbia U P, 1964, 44-59.
- McInnis, Judy. "The Moral and Formal Dimensions of Fernando de Herrera's Purist Aesthetics." *Classical Modes in Literature*. Proceedings of the IXth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association. Innsbruck, 1981.
- Orozco Díaz, Emilio. *Manierismo y Barroco*. Salamanca: Anaya, 1970.
- Prieto, Antonio. *La poesía española del Siglo XVI*. Vol. 2. Madrid: Cátedra, 1987.
- Rivers, Elias L. Capitulo VI: L'epoca di Filippo II: "La lirica." Trad. G. Prato. In *Storia della civiltà letteraria spagnola, I: Dalle origini al seicento*. Ed. F. Merigalli. Torino: UTET, 1990. 385-99.
- Rodríguez Marín, F. *El Divino Herrera y la Condesa de Gelves. Conferencia leída en el Ateneo de Madrid el día 1.º de junio de 1911*. Madrid: B. Rodríguez, 1911.
- Francisco de Rioja. *Poesía*. Ed. Begoña López Bueno. Madrid: Cátedra, 1984.
- Sinicropi, Giovanni. *Saggio sulle 'Soledades' de Góngora*. Bologna: Cappelli, 1976.
- Socarras, Cayetano J. "Fernando de Herrera (El rompimiento del equilibrio renacentista)." *Estudios de historia, literatura y arte hispánicos ofrecidos a Rodrigo A. Molina*. Madrid: Insula, 1977.
- Vilanova, Antonio. "Fernando de Herrera." *Historia general de las literaturas hispánicas*. Vol. 2. Barcelona: Barra, 1951.
- Vranich, Stanko B. "Críticos, critiquillos y criticones (Herrera frente a Sevilla)." *Ensayos Sevillanos del Siglo de Oro*. Valencia: Albatros Hispanófila, 1981.